

UNIVERSAL DESIGN COMMITTEE
Division of the State Architect Advisory Board

Final Minutes of Public Meeting
Thursday, September 15, 2005

California Community Colleges Building
1102 Q Street, 5th Floor, Conference Room B
Sacramento, California

Committee Members Present

John Paul Scott, Chair
Gale Bate
Chris Lawrence
Ron Mincer, Vice Chair (by telephone)
Pete Peterson
Sharon Toji (by telephone)

Committee Members Absent

Chad Allen
Pete Guisasola
Peter Margen
Mike Modugno
Bob Nicol

DSA Staff Present

David Thorman, State Architect
Mary Ann Aguayo
Linda Huber
Aaron Noble
Louise Redeen
Elizabeth Schroeder
Derek M. Shaw

Others Present

David Adams, Tot Turf
Elouise Bird, Sof Solutions, Inc.
Ron Cohea, National Playground
Safety Institute
Eric Denning, Cal Sports & Rec.
Glenn Gall, OSHPD
Don Harris, OSHPD
Richard Hawley, Tot Turf
Eric Huber, Dave Bang Associates
Lisa Konarski, Schools Insurance
Authority
Rob McNeill, BOMA
Henry Mustacato, Fibar
Ian Padilla, CASH
Willa Pettygrove, City of Davis
David Spease, CPRS
Alex Tsitovich, Cal Sports & Rec.
Ted Wait, Golden State Advisory
Fran Wallach

1 **Call to Order and Introductions**

2 Committee Chair John Paul Scott called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and
3 welcomed everyone. He reviewed the agenda, and meeting participants took turns
4 introducing themselves.

5
6 **Review Previous Minutes and Follow-Up Items**

7 Mr. Scott said there were no minutes from the last meeting because of technical
8 glitches, but the committee approved two motions: one was a recommendation that
9 DSA form a new committee to discuss the performance and accessibility of fire alarm
10 pull stations; the second one was a request for DSA staff to send out the committee's

1 proposals regarding play area surfaces and door opening force, and those documents
2 were disseminated. Mr. Scott noted only one editorial comment was received on the
3 door opening force resolution, so the proposals are ready for committee action at this
4 meeting.

5 6 **Information Items**

7 **2005 Code Change Proposals**

8 Mr. Aaron Noble said the 2005 code change proposals will be part of the ICC code
9 adoption process.

10 11 **DSA ICC Code Adoption**

12 Mr. Noble advised that DSA anticipates that all items currently in the California Building
13 Code will be continued, and there will be 300 or 400 amendments. He said DSA plans
14 to have the amendment package ready to submit to the Building Standards Commission
15 in May of 2006, and the committee will be reviewing the changes in January.

16
17 Mr. Noble noted DSA expects to hear from the Department of Justice regarding
18 certification of California's accessibility guidelines. Mr. Scott said about five states have
19 attained certification so far.

20
21 Mr. Gale Bate asked if California will have a separate Chapter 11 when the new code is
22 adopted. Mr. Noble responded that DSA anticipates proposing continuance of Chapter
23 11B.

24
25 Mr. Bate noted a Web-based process has been established to obtain stakeholder and
26 public feedback on the structural code changes, and he asked if a similar mechanism
27 will be provided for accessibility. Mr. Noble said the items simply being proposed for
28 continuance might not need that program, but it might be possible to use the Web-
29 based participation system in addition to the normal rulemaking process. He added that
30 DSA plans to implement the Web-based system for all future code change cycles.

31
32 Mr. Scott noted Housing and Community Development (HCD) redrafted Chapter 11A to
33 mirror the current Chapter 11B, and DSA did the same thing last year. He asked if the
34 ICC code adoption process will mean that Chapter 11A will become out of step. Mr.
35 Noble said the Chapter 11B rulemaking will be coordinated with HCD, and all changes
36 required for DOJ certification will be forwarded to HCD.

37 38 **Chapter 11A Code Change Issue - 10% Visitable Housing and Bathroom - Publicly** 39 **Funded Housing**

40 Mr. Noble explained that this issue resulted from the passage of SB 1025, regarding
41 multi-story dwelling units and covered multi-family dwellings. He said DSA submitted
42 emergency regulations to implement the law, but the proposal had to be withdrawn
43 pending approval from the Department and Agency. He noted DSA now expects to be
44 submitting the emergency regulations to the Building Standards Commission in
45 December.

46
47 Mr. Scott noted SB 1025 permits either a powder room or bathroom on the ground floor,
48 meaning the facility is "visitable," but not necessarily "livable." He asked Mr. Noble to
49 explain DSA's position on the carriage house issue as well. Mr. Noble responded that
50 DSA is currently working with American Institute of Architects (AIA), the Building
51 Industry Association, and the California Independent Living Centers, who were involved
52 in sponsoring SB 1025. He said DSA's position has not yet been formalized.

1
2 Mr. Noble noted HCD is proposing an exemption for carriage units, or dwelling units on
3 top of private garages. He said the language of the bill speaks in terms of "bathroom,"
4 but the HCD proposal refers to "bathroom or powder room." California Independent
5 Living Centers objected to expanding the terminology and request that the language be
6 changed to "bathroom."
7

8 Mr. Scott pointed out that in addition to schools and essential services buildings, DSA
9 has jurisdiction over publicly funded dwelling units. He said San Francisco is
10 developing 8,000 carriage units in an old naval shipyard, and those units would be
11 exempt from visibility, adaptability, and fair housing requirements. He asked whether
12 the committee wanted to weigh in on the issue.
13

14 Mr. Gale Bate observed that this item will be going to the Building Standards
15 Commission on September 21. He suggested waiting to find out what happens before
16 doing anything about housing units. Mr. Noble noted HCD has to re-establish its finding
17 of emergency to extend the rulemaking process.
18

19 Mr. Ron Mincer expressed concern about allowing public funds to be spent on housing
20 units that will not be accessible to people with disabilities. Ms. Sharon Toji agreed.
21 Committee members observed that state accessibility law is not intended to be
22 subverted by building carriage units or multi-story dwellings.
23

24 Mr. Ron Mincer proposed that the committee study this issue and provide the State
25 Architect with the information needed to ensure accessibility in housing units built with
26 public funds.
27

28 Mr. Scott suggested recommending that: 1) a bathroom be required in the visitable unit,
29 not a "bathroom or powder room," and 2) the visitable units are in addition to any
30 accessible units required under federal law.
31

32 Mr. Chris Lawrence clarified that all accessible units are also considered "visitable." Mr.
33 Scott explained that the rationale behind the percentage requirement is to ensure more
34 visitable units, defined as having a zero grade entry, an accessible route through the
35 ground floor, and a usable toilet.
36

37 Mr. Noble noted that DHS has taken a definition position on SB 1025. He encouraged
38 committee members to read the text of SB 1025 before taking action. He also
39 expressed concern that this was not listed on the agenda as a possible action item, and
40 there may be members of the public interested in providing input.
41

42 Mr. Scott noted a description of the issue was included in the agenda, and committee
43 motions are not binding anyway.
44

45 **Mr. Ron Mincer made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to recommend that**
46 **DSA support changing the language to "bathroom" rather than "powder room."**
47

48 Mr. Peterson said he shared Mr. Noble's concerns about taking action on this item
49 without notice to the public. He pointed out there is a separate category of "Action
50 Items" on the second page of the agenda.
51

52 **Mr. Mincer withdrew his motion.**

1 Mr. Bate suggested dealing with this topic under “New Business” and agendizing it for
2 action at the next meeting. He noted the committee will have a chance to review DSA’s
3 proposal before December.

4
5 Mr. Scott asked the staff to provide the committee in advance with DSA’s proposals on
6 the following three issues: 1) “bathroom” versus “powder room,” 2) application of the 10
7 percent visitable requirement to carriage units, and 3) the applicability of 504
8 requirements to publicly funded housing units.

9
10 Mr. Noble said that in July, DSA submitted emergency regulations implementing SB
11 1025, but specifically not adopting the carriage unit exception. At that time, DSA was
12 not aware of the issue surrounding “bathroom” and “powder room,” so the regulations
13 went through with the language proposed by HCD. However, the bill uses the term
14 “bathroom.”

15
16 Committee members talked about whether the issue should go to the DSA Advisory
17 Board. Mr. Noble said there might not be time to consult the Board, depending on the
18 Board’s meeting schedule.

19
20 Mr. Scott indicated he would bring this issue to the Board’s attention as part of his report
21 on committee activities.

22
23 Mr. Scott noted the committee should draft a thank-you letter to the State Fire Marshal
24 for attending the last meeting and let him know the committee is recommending
25 formation of a task group to work on accessible fire alarm pulls and other accessibility
26 issues. Ms. Aguayo advised that the letter should come from either the Board’s
27 Executive Director or the Board’s chair. Committee members expressed support for the
28 idea of drafting a thank-you letter.

29
30 Mr. Bate suggested bringing this to the Board’s attention as part of the committee
31 report.

32
33 Mr. Scott said he would draft a letter for Ms. Aguayo’s signature, pending review and
34 approval by the committee and the Board.

35 36 **Task Groups**

37 **Play Areas - Proposed Resolution and Public Comments**

38 Mr. Scott noted former committee member Richard Skaff brought the committee’s
39 attention to problems regarding use of engineered wood fiber surfaces and accessibility
40 in school playgrounds. The committee passed a motion to recommend that DSA
41 require maintainable materials in accessible route portions of playgrounds within its
42 jurisdiction. The committee also established a task group to look into these issues in
43 more detail. Mr. Scott added that he personally visited at least 40 playgrounds with
44 engineered wood fiber, and none of the surfaces were being properly maintained.

45
46 Mr. Scott explained that the committee’s role is advisory only, and task groups were
47 formed to do work outside of the main committee. The committee sends
48 recommendations to the DSA Advisory Board, and that body votes to accept the
49 recommendations. From there, they are forwarded to DSA for consideration and
50 implementation. If a code change is required, DSA engages in a formal rulemaking
51 process to solicit public input and submit the language to the Building Standards
52 Commission for adoption.

1
2 Mr. Scott noted there are two state laws covering playgrounds, one from the 1970's
3 requiring a certain portion of playground equipment to be accessible, and a second law,
4 passed in 2000, that requires school districts to have all playgrounds inspected by a
5 certified playground inspector and includes requirements for accessibility. Mr. Scott
6 said a proposed new law would bring California to the current ASTM 1487 standard.

7
8 Mr. Scott observed that the committee passed two motions recommending that DSA
9 adopt a policy that engineered wood fiber is not maintainable as an accessible route
10 material. He said the committee's investigation revealed improper product quality
11 control, lack of staffing for proper maintenance, and improper compacting after
12 maintenance is performed. The committee found that most playboxes are either
13 surrounded by a raised curb or situated in a pit, and wood chip surfaces are not stable
14 enough for wheelchair access. The committee learned are no standards regarding the
15 transition from a hard surface to a soft-surface playbox. Mr. Scott noted that ASTM
16 standards for accessibility assume level conditions, but materials are sometimes used
17 on ramps. He observed that there is also a general lack of information from the industry
18 regarding the expected life cycle of engineered wood fiber materials. Mr. Scott said the
19 committee concluded that schools do not have the time and money to maintain
20 engineered wood fiber surfaces, and there are an increasing number of class action
21 lawsuits against school districts in California on this issue.

22
23 Mr. Scott noted the committee determined that DSA does have responsibility to plan-
24 check and inspect playgrounds as part of the approval process for projects over
25 \$20,000 or so. The committee passed a motion recommending that DSA begin carrying
26 out these functions.

27
28 Mr. Peterson clarified that only projects above \$25,000 with structural components are
29 subject to DSA review, but fire life safety and accessibility codes still apply. He noted
30 the equipment itself is exempt, and the path of travel is reviewed only when the project
31 involves structural work. Mr. Scott said Mr. Richard Conrad indicated that DSA's
32 jurisdiction was broader.

33
34 Mr. Noble stated that there is currently a \$25,000 threshold for alteration projects
35 subject to DSA review for access compliance. He noted committee members pointed
36 out previously that the law provides for increasing the threshold according to a specified
37 index.

38
39 Mr. Scott drew attention to the proposed resolution on play areas.

40
41 **Mr. Mincer made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lawrence, to forward the proposed**
42 **recommendations to the DSA Advisory Board.**

43
44 Ms. Fran Wallach said she had a number of comments on the resolution.

45
46 Mr. Mincer expressed his opinion that engineered wood fiber was an unacceptable play
47 area surface for accessibility. Mr. Peterson noted the document implies that any
48 materials meeting the standards are acceptable.

49
50 Mr. Peterson recommended deleting Item 10. He noted the inspections are already
51 required by state law, and they are not being done.

1 Mr. Bate asked if the state law defines the enforcement authority. Mr. Scott noted that
2 the regulations fall within general health and safety, so everyone is responsible. Mr.
3 Bate said he thought school districts were responsible for the inspections, not DSA. Mr.
4 Noble observed that there are probably many playground projects that are not
5 submitted to DSA.

6
7 Mr. Scott pointed out it will still be up to DSA to decide how to deal with the committee's
8 recommendations.

9
10 Mr. Peterson objected to requiring all playground projects to provide a certificate of
11 inspection to DSA.

12
13 **Mr. Mincer accepted Mr. Peterson's suggestion to delete Item 10 as an**
14 **amendment to his motion.**

15
16 Mr. Lawrence said a number of the comments indicate there is no certification process
17 currently available for playground inspectors.

18
19 Mr. Scott noted the purpose of the policy is to explain to playground designers and
20 provide criteria for how to design an accessible route into a playbox. He clarified that
21 the committee is not addressing certification. He added that state law requires
22 certification and defines what a certified inspector is.

23
24 Mr. Scott welcomed comments from members of the public. He asked speakers to limit
25 their remarks to three minutes. Mr. Scott invited Ms. Wallach to present her comments
26 first and offered to provide a bit more time for her.

27
28 Ms. Wallach cautioned that whatever happens in California affects the rest of the
29 country. She said she had some general comments about the contents of the proposed
30 resolution.

31
32 Ms. Wallach noted the resolution proposes that DSA require inspections by a certified
33 inspector. Mr. Scott clarified that the committee was dropping that language. He added
34 that state law still requires those inspections. Ms. Wallach said certified accessibility
35 specialists are not qualified to inspect playgrounds, and there are no formal training
36 programs for playground inspectors.

37
38 Ms. Wallach expressed concern that the requirement for rubber-based surfacing will
39 result in schools purchasing and installing less equipment. She asked if the state will
40 provide funding to make up for the equipment that would normally be purchased;
41 otherwise, she noted, manufacturers, installers, schools, and especially children, will
42 suffer.

43
44 Ms. Wallach noted there is a lack of agreement about which ASTM standard should be
45 followed, and the standards themselves are constantly changing. She stated that a ban
46 on engineered wood fiber will destroy a multi-million-dollar industry in California without
47 cause. Ms. Wallach said engineered wood fiber surfaces meet the specified ASTM
48 standards and have been approved for accessibility by the U.S. Access Board. She
49 further objected that there no studies, statistics, or figures to validate the proposed ban.
50 Ms. Wallach urged DSA to focus instead on identifying problems, and then offer viable
51 solutions to issues that have been identified.

1 Ms. Wallach asked the following questions:
2 1. Who will provide accessibility training? How will specialists be certified? Who
3 will pay for training?
4 2. Who will provide funds for playground equipment? How much financial impact
5 will the proposed resolutions have on the playground industry and equipment
6 installers?
7 3. How much will it cost to replace unusable equipment? Who will cover that cost?
8 4. What is the economic impact of the resolutions on the engineered wood fiber
9 industry? What is the impact on new products and potential new products?
10 5. Where do we go from here to identify procedures and standards to be followed?
11 She said that until these questions are answered, California should refrain from being
12 involved in developing poor or harmful programs. She recommended postponing
13 efforts until then.
14

15 Mr. Alex Tsitovich, California Sports & Recreation, presented a letter from the
16 International Playground Equipment Manufacturers Association. Mr. Scott said all
17 written materials will be made part of the record.
18

19 Ms. Elouise Bird, Sof Solutions, expressed concern about various surfacing products
20 that would not be allowed if the proposed resolution is approved. She recommended
21 considering any products meeting standards and specifications. Mr. Scott clarified that
22 products other than engineered wood fiber could be used for accessible areas if they
23 meet the specific ASTM standards mentioned. He added that if DSA will need to go
24 through a public rulemaking process if the State Architect decides to follow the
25 committee's recommendations and change the applicable regulations.
26

27 Ms. Bird said manufacturers can help educate end users about proper maintenance.
28 Mr. Scott commented that this kind of education is not happening, and the products are
29 not being maintained properly. He observed that failure to maintain accessible routes
30 exposes school districts to potential liability, as evidenced by the increasing number of
31 lawsuits being filed over this issue.
32

33 Mr. Scott proposed an amendment to the pending motion. He suggested rewording
34 the last sentence before the bulleted list in Item 7 to say: "This may take the form of
35 rubber tiles, mats, or poured-in-place rubber products or other products that are not
36 composed of loose material and that meet the ASTM 1292 and 1951."
37

38 **Mr. Mincer accepted this amendment to his motion.**
39

40 Ms. Bird asked whether DSA had any documentation supporting this recommendation.
41 She noted industry people can provide studies and written information that might help.
42 Mr. Scott offered to take participants to various school playgrounds after the meeting to
43 point out the problems. He said none of the 40 playgrounds he visited were properly
44 maintained, and the surfaces were not accessible. He added that school districts lack
45 the staff to handle the necessary maintenance.
46

47 Mr. Ron Cohea, National Playground Safety Institute (NPSI), expressed support for
48 deleting Item 10. He said the NPSI still feels that certified playground safety inspectors
49 are the best people to inspect playgrounds, but NPSI does not offer this kind of training.
50 He pointed out that DSA or some other agency would need to train the certified
51 inspectors. Mr. Scott noted that training is usually provided by the profession involved,

1 and he cited architecture as an example. He said DSA has trained some of its staff as
2 accessibility specialists, but there is no certification process.

3
4 Mr. Scott stated that SB 262 requires DSA to develop a certification system for
5 accessibility specialists, but the areas of specialization are not defined. DSA has
6 identified two categories of specialists, one for licensed architects and engineers and
7 another for accessibility investigators/plan reviewers, and DSA is in the process of
8 developing exams and training for both specialties. Mr. Scott noted DSA might want to
9 set up a third category for playground specialists.

10
11 Mr. Scott emphasized that the committee's concern is with accessibility, not safety, so
12 concerns about the appropriateness of specific ASTM standards should be directed to
13 the proper regulatory authorities.

14
15 Mr. Henry Mustacato, Fibar, noted there is a device that can be used to test field
16 accessibility, and the ASTM Subcommittee on Surfacing is expected to revise ASTM
17 1951 in November to include that device in testing. Mr. Scott said the device is not
18 effective in testing the movement of materials on sloped surfaces like ramps.

19
20 Mr. Mustacato asked if there was any test data supporting the committee's
21 recommendations. Mr. Scott explained that the committee's work was not technical and
22 statistical, and the recommendations represent the consensus of opinion among the
23 committee members. He admitted the committee's evidence was anecdotal and
24 subjective, but noted most people in the accessibility field feel the same way.

25
26 Mr. Scott asked why the play equipment standard has 8-inch steps when other building
27 codes limit steps to 7 inches. Ms. Wallach noted the Access Board uses 8 inches for
28 tread heights. Mr. Scott said 8-inch risers came from the manufacturers.

29
30 Mr. Mustacato pointed out that school districts do not understand the difference
31 between wood chips and engineered wood fiber. Ms. Wallach suggested
32 recommending that DSA not allow mixtures of wood chips and engineered wood fiber.
33 Other participants agreed.

34
35 Mr. Scott proposed discussing the three age groups and recommended transfer
36 platform seat heights, and he drew attention to Section 15.6.5.1.2 on Page 6. Ms.
37 Wallach noted the standard assumes that the youngest children will have assistance
38 getting onto play equipment. Committee members concluded that the three age groups
39 make sense to ensure usability for younger children.

40
41 Mr. Scott proposed adding a recommendation saying, "Platform surface height above
42 the ground or floor is recommended to be of a height suitable for the end user age
43 group," and then referring to the table in Section 15.6.5.1.2. He noted the 12 inches for
44 ages 3 to 4 should be a maximum height, not an absolute. Committee members
45 expressed support for these changes.

46
47 Mr. Tsitovich expressed concern about the impact of the proposed recommendations on
48 the playground industry. He noted the new rules could double or triple the cost of
49 playground structures.

50
51 Mr. Tsitovich noted that requiring certified inspections does not make sense unless
52 there are sufficient resources for training and enforcement. Mr. Scott said the proposed

1 policy calls for DSA to police playground accessibility. He added that the industry needs
2 to start training its people to understand accessibility. He pointed out the law requiring
3 inspection has been on the books since 2000, and the civil rights protections of the
4 Unruh Act, as well as accessibility codes, apply to school playgrounds in California.
5 Mr. Tsitovich commented that appeals and litigation regarding inspection issues could
6 also be expensive.

7
8 Mr. Tsitovich added that reports of improper maintenance are disturbing. He noted any
9 material will fail if it is not properly maintained, and school districts need to accept that
10 responsibility.

11
12 Mr. Ian Padilla, Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH), explained that his
13 organization represents the school design community, facility managers, and
14 maintenance and operations people. He said some CASH members are concerned
15 about the recommendations because of potential cost impacts and maintenance issues.
16 He noted CASH wants to continue working with DSA to make sure the
17 recommendations work for the end users. He added that CASH's primary focus will be
18 on the practical considerations associated with implementation.

19
20 Mr. Scott asked what CASH is doing to educate its constituents about these problems.
21 Mr. Padilla responded that CASH provides workshops, written information, and a
22 maintenance network to keep schools apprised of important issues. He added that
23 schools in California are already facing higher costs and more rigorous maintenance
24 requirements, and there are limited resources to address these needs.

25
26 Mr. Eric Huber observed that the 6-inch maximum step height in Section 15.6.5.2.2 is a
27 more an issue for play equipment manufacturers than for schools. He proposed making
28 the 6-inch height a recommendation rather than a requirement. Mr. Mincer agreed that
29 the 6-inch maximum should be a recommendation.

30
31 Mr. Scott proposed attaching all the written comments received and forwarding the
32 revised resolution on to the DSA Advisory Board.

33
34 **Mr. Mincer accepted this amendment to his motion.**

35
36 Mr. Scott noted that the following individuals and entities submitted written comments:
37 Henry Mustacato, Fibar Systems; Mike Hayward; Elouise R. Bird, Sof Solutions; Ted
38 Eljas, Ziegler Brothers, Inc.; Dennis and Joanne Sharp, Sharp Design Consultants;
39 Debbie Walker, Mission Oaks Recreation and Parks District; Jane H. Adams, California
40 Parks and Recreation Society; Barry Schulman; Wyatt W. Underwood, Safeguard
41 Surfacing Corporation; Jay Beckwith; Ron Cohea, North Bay Schools Insurance
42 Authority; Steven King; David Spease; Ron Mincer; Noel Nudeck; R. K. "Pete" Peterson;
43 Ron Hoover, Canadian Playground Advisory, Inc.; Safe Deck; Anneliese Mulloch,
44 Pathway Systems, Inc.; Peggy Greenwell, U.S. Access Board; Thomas Kalusik,
45 National Playground Safety Institute; IPEMA; and Brian Lewis, CASBO.

46
47 **The motion to forward the resolution to the DSA Advisory Board was carried 4 - 2**
48 **(Mr. Peterson and Mr. Bate opposed).**

49
50 Mr. Scott noted it is uncertain as to whether DSA will develop policies and/or regulations
51 to implement the committee's recommendations. He thanked the people who made
52 comments and proposed moving on to the next agenda item.

Participants asked how they would be notified of DSA's decision. Ms. Aguayo explained that the notification process depends on whether DSA adopts a policy or develops new regulations. She said the staff will keep the DSA Advisory Board informed as to the status of the recommendations.

Automated and Power-Assisted Door Openers - Proposed Resolution

Mr. Lawrence said the task group is proposing that DSA require automatic door openers or power-assisted doors on primary public entries. The proposed resolution identifies places where power-assisted doors are appropriate and defines standards for placement and operation.

Mr. Bate observed that the task group was going beyond recommending changing the standard back to 8.5 pounds exterior door-opening force. Mr. Scott said that after looking at the problems associated with the force levels, the task group concluded that automated and power-assisted doors would be a more workable option.

Mr. Mincer made a motion, seconded by Mr. Peterson, to forward the proposed recommendations to the DSA Advisory Board.

Mr. Scott invited public comments, but there were no members of the audience who wished to address the committee on this matter.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Peterson noted the one written comment received on this issue should be appended to the materials forwarded to the DSA Advisory Board.

UD Newsletter

Mr. Scott drew attention to the newsletter hosted by John Salem, and suggested that the committee consider contributing items about some of California's activities. He noted possible topics might be the selection of the IBC for California, the new visibility law, HCD's draft universal design ordinance, DSA's excellence program, the certified access specialist program, and the committee's activities. Mr. Scott added that the next issue of the newsletter will be coming out soon.

Mr. Bate noted the decision to contribute an article would have to come from the DSA Advisory Board or the State Architect.

Ms. Aguayo suggested drafting an article on behalf of the committee and having the article approved by the Board for publication. Committee members expressed support for this approach. Mr. Scott volunteered to draft an article.

Annual Report to DSA Advisory Board

Summary of Accomplishments

Mr. Scott said he needed to make a report at the next Board meeting summarizing the committee's key accomplishments during the past year, and he welcomed input from committee members.

Action Plan for Next Year

Mr. Scott suggested talking about the future of the committee, its composition and size, and key priorities for next year. He noted some of the committee's activities will be providing input to DSA on proposed code provisions and working with the State Fire

1 Marshal on coordination issues. He suggested disbanding the task groups on door
2 opening force and play areas.

3
4 Mr. Noble said there are a few policy issues the staff plans to bring back to the
5 committee at the next meeting.

6
7 Mr. Scott reported that he has talking with Mr. Conrad and the State Architect about
8 forming a separate committee to deal with actual universal design issues and changing
9 this committee's focus to accessibility issues. He suggested changing the name of the
10 committee to better reflect its emphasis.

11
12 After some discussion, committee members agreed to change the committee's name to
13 "Access Review Committee." They proposed keeping 12 members. Mr. Scott said he
14 would notify the Advisory Board that there are three vacant positions on the committee.

15
16 Mr. Scott suggested discussing terms for non-Board committee members. Ms. Aguayo
17 advised that the current draft policies and procedures say committee members serve
18 two-year terms, with a possibility of renewal, and members with expired terms can serve
19 an additional year or until a replacement is appointed, whichever occurs first.

20
21 Mr. Scott invited participants to submit names of people who might be interested in the
22 vacant committee positions. He suggested that candidates submit an email introduction
23 and résumé. Ms. Aguayo noted the current policy calls for nominations to come from an
24 organization rather than individuals, so candidates should also submit an appropriate
25 letter of support.

26
27 Ms. Sharon Toji suggested Ms. Roberta Call, an expert in universal design and
28 accessibility, and she offered to contact her.

29
30 Mr. Peterson recommended talking with DSA about establishing a certification program
31 for playground inspectors or dealing with the issue as part of special inspections. Mr.
32 Scott said he would bring this issue to the Board's attention.

33
34 Ms. Toji noted there had been some talk about establishing a certified signage specialist
35 program, and she expressed support for creating that specialty. Mr. Scott said he would
36 mention signage specialists to the Board as well.

37 38 **Schedule Next Meeting**

39 Mr. Scott said the ADA conference originally planned for the fall will be held next
40 February or March. He noted the committee previously set Thursday, November 17, as
41 the next meeting date, but that date can be moved. After some discussion, committee
42 members agreed to hold the meeting on Wednesday, November 16, in Sacramento.

43 44 **New Business**

45 Mr. Mincer suggested discussing the 5-pound door force requirement for doors to fire-
46 rated corridors. Mr. Scott said the same problem occurs with hallway doors into trash
47 chute rooms.

48
49 Mr. Mincer proposed also talking about path of travel through parking lots. Mr. Scott
50 said a related question is whether areas where roots cross parking lots are hazardous
51 vehicular ways that need to be defined by detectable warnings.

1 Committee members agreed that the code provisions pertaining to exiting signage and
2 path of travel signage need to be clarified. Mr. Scott noted DSA might be able to
3 address these problems with a policy.
4

5 **Meeting Summary/Next Steps**

6 Mr. Bate noted DSA will probably have to rewrite many of the current code provisions to
7 make terminology consistent with that used in the IBC.
8

9 **Public Comments**

10 There were no members of the public who wished to address the committee.
11

12 **Adjournment**

13 There being no further business, the meeting of the Universal Design Committee was
14 adjourned at 2:00 p.m.